APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,525	06/15/2001	Paul Egli	LS/0016.00	9946

8791	7590	12/23/2004	

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER
RAMPURIA, SATISH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2124	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 June 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/07/03*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the application filed on 06/15/2001.

2.   Claims 1-45 are pending.

Specification

3.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains more than 150 words.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4.   The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other

form of browser-executable code e.g., page 2, lines 26 and 31. Applicant is required to

delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP

§ 608.01.

5.   The use of the trademark "Java" has been noted in this application. It should be

appropriate or proper term (see MPEP 608.01(v)) used, wherever it appears and be

accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible

in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every

effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity

as trademarks.

Appropriate correction is required

Information Disclosure Statement

6.   An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449 filed on 11/12/2003 is attached

to the instant Office action.

Claim objections

7.   Claims 17, 20, 21, 27, 40, 41, and 43 are objected to because of the following

informalities:

The use of the trademark "Java" has been noted in these claims. It should be appropriate

or proper term (see MPEP 608.01(v)) used, wherever it appears and be accompanied by the

generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the

proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in

any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8.   Claims 17, 20, 21, 27, 40, 41, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph,

as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Clarification and/or correction are required.

Claims 17, 20, 21, 27, 40, 41, and 43 contain the trademark/trade name Java. Where a trademark

or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or

product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

See Ex parte Simpson, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the

trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product.

A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves.

Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the

trademark or trade name.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claim 1-12, 15, 17-20, 21-32, 35, 37-41, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2002/0129060 to Rollins et al.

(hereinafter called Rollins) in view of US Patent No. 6,675,354 to Claussen et al.

(hereinafter called Claussen).

Per claims 1, 2, and 41:

Rollins disclose:

-   providing a Web application framework (title), said framework including an abstract

    command tag that predefines at least some generic Web application activities (page 2,

    paragraph 15 "based upon an XML schema and a set of user customization rules");

-   specifying at least one custom action (page 2, paragraph 15 "a set of user customization

    rules") that is desired to be performed by a Web application under development (page 2;

    paragraph 15 "produce a set of components that interact to provide a user-specific...

    XML document");

- creating a Java class that extends the abstract command tag for providing execution logic for said at least one custom action (page 3, paragraph 38 "a set of Java classes designed to mediate communication between the user and the synchronized tree manager"), in addition to pre-existing logic that supports said at least some generic Web application activities, thereby creating a corresponding customized command tag that is capable of being embedded within a Web page;

- embedding the customized command tag in a Web page of the Web application (page 2, paragraph 34 "XML data ... allows access for all users despite input/output restrictions"); and

Rollins does not explicitly disclose executing the Web application, including invoking the customized command tag for conditionally executing said specified at least one custom action based on run-time conditions.

However, Claussen discloses in an analogous computer system executing the Web application, including invoking the customized command tag for conditionally executing said specified at least one custom action based on run-time conditions (col. 3, lines 31-42 "Upon encountering a custom tag, an appropriate tag handler... is invoked... a tag registration routine is used for recognizing... if the name does not match one of the registered tags, the routing converts the name... If the tag recognition routine recognizes the name... it converts the attributes to the appropriate case... hands the resulting element off to a correct handler for processing").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method to execute the appropriate tag as taught by

Claussen into the method of developing web applications as taught by Rollins. The modification

would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to implement

only those tags which are needed to provide new techniques for publishing Internet content that

can fully leverage the manipulation and template mechanism of XSLT with the scripting

capability of the JSP/SAP model as suggested by Claussen (col. 3, lines 7-11).

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further, Rollins disclose:

- wherein said run-time parameters are specified via Hypertext Transport Protocol (HTTP)

   parameters, during invocation of the customized command tag (page 1, paragraph 10

   "XML... deliver this data by use of the standard HTTP protocol... layer protocol").

Per claims 4-7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Rollins disclose:

- wherein said abstract command tag comprises an abstract base class (page 3, paragraph

   38 "user... specify a set of customization rules... the result of code-generation is a set of

   Java classes...").

Per claims 8-11:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Rollins does not explicitly disclose wherein said customized command tag includes an ability to conditionally affect application flow based on results obtained from a specified action.

However, Claussen discloses in an analogous computer system wherein said customized command tag includes an ability to conditionally affect application flow based on results obtained from a specified action (col. 3, lines 31-42 "Upon encountering a custom tag, an appropriate tag handler... is invoked... a tag registration routine is used for recognizing... if the name does not match one of the registered tags, the routing converts the name... If the tag recognition routine recognizes the name... it converts the attributes to the appropriate case... hands the resulting element off to a correct handler for processing").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method to execute the appropriate tag as taught by Claussen into the method of developing web applications as taught by Rollins. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to implement only those tags which are needed to provide new techniques for publishing Internet content that can fully leverage the manipulation and template mechanism of XSLT with the scripting capability of the JSP/SAP model as suggested by Claussen (col. 3, lines 7-11).

Per claims 12 and 15:

The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and further, Rollins disclose:

- wherein said application flow includes routing to a different page than is currently

    displayed in a user's browser (page 3, paragraph 36 "generating multiple customizable

    interfaces for XML documents").

Per claims 17 and 18:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Rollins disclose:

- wherein said customized command tag is invoked when an end user activates a link that

    points to a Web page containing the customized command tag (page 3, paragraph 48

    "The Renderer defines the concept of a cursor... of the registered mediators should be

    rendering the portion of the tree pointed to by the cursor. When the cursor is moved, the

    new view of the tree should be rendered... a mediator will have to move the cursor more

    than one time to achieve the desired view...").

Per claims 19, 43, and 44:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Rollins does not explicitly disclose wherein

said Web page containing the customized command tag comprises a JSP (JavaServer Page)

compatible page.

However, Claussen discloses in an analogous computer system wherein said Web page

containing the customized command tag comprises a JSP (JavaServer Page) compatible page

(col. 6, lines 18-20 "custom tags are registered through an XML... according to JSP 1.0

specification").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of using JSP compatible page as taught by

Claussen into the method of developing web applications as taught by Rollins. The modification

would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to implement

only those tags which are needed to provide new techniques for publishing Internet content that

can fully leverage the manipulation and template mechanism of XSLT with the scripting

capability of the JSP/SAP model as suggested by Claussen (col. 3, lines 7-11).

Per claim 20:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Rollins does not explicitly disclose

compiling the JSP-compatible page into a servlet, said servlet corresponding to said created Java

class that extends the abstract command tag.

However, Claussen discloses in an analogous computer system compiling the JSP-

compatible page into a servlet, said servlet corresponding to said created Java class that extends

the abstract command tag (Fig. 2 and col. 6, lines 14-18 "routine continues... to gather all

jsp:directives.page tags to ensure a consistent state.. jsp tag libraries (which provide support for

JSP 1.0 mechanism)").

The feature of compiling the JSP-compatible page into a servlet would be obvious for the

reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 21-32, 35, and 37-40 are the system claims corresponding to method claims 1-12, 15,

and 17-20 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the

rejection of claims 1-12, 15, and 17-20 respectively, above.

11.   Claims 13, 14, 16, 33, 34, 36, 42, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Rollins and Claussen in view of US Patent No. 6,760,748 to Hakim

(hereinafter called Hakim).

Per claims 13 and 42:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, neither Rollins nor Claussen disclose

wherein said generic Web application activities include error recording.

However, Hakim discloses in an analogous computer system wherein said generic Web

application activities include error recording (col. 44, lines 38-39 "station sample link

conditions if 'Roaming' is enabled, transmission errors are recorded").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of recording errors for the network activities

as taught by Hakim into the method of developing web application as taught by the combination

system by Rollins and Claussen. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary

skill in the art would be motivated to record the errors to provide the appropriate feedback for

different types to of questions as suggested by Hakim (col. 2 and 3, lines 58-67 and 1-14).

Per claims 14, 16, and 45:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, neither Rollins nor Claussen disclose

wherein said generic Web application activities include filtering of requests.

However, Hakim discloses in an analogous computer system wherein said generic Web

application activities include filtering of requests (col. 29, lines 40-43 "With the addition of

optional components (plug-ins), it is possible to extend their functionality to perform detailed

content filtering, report generation").

The feature of filtering the requests would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the

rejection of claim 13.

Claims 33, 34, and 36 are the system claims corresponding to method claims 13, 14, and 16

respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of

claims 13, 14, and 16 respectively, above.

Conclusion

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to **Satish S. Rampuria** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3732**.

The examiner can normally be reached on **8:30 am to 6:00 pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, **Kakali Chaki** can be reached on **(571) 272-3719**. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2124
12/13/2004

KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100